



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO.
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	----------------------

08/334843 11/04/94 Ze'Ev Drori

392.6

EXAMINER

Weldon

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2609

69

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. L. Roberts (appl. rep.) (3)

(2) U. Weldon (PTO) (4)

Date of interview 2/20/96

Type: Telephonic Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. was not reached.

Claims discussed: 95,96, 98-110

Identification of prior art discussed: Pinnow, Sanders et al, Tolson, Aydin

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See the attached sheet. The first paragraph; 35 USC 112- objection and rejection will be dropped. The 101 double patenting rejection will be changed to an obvious double patenting rejection. Mr. Drori has stated (Declaration of 1/29/96) without any evidence that his "invention has literally obsoleted systems which do not include" his invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Ulysses Weldon
Examiner's Signature

Feb.20,1996
SN.08/334835

1. Pinnow teaches a control unit with a digital memory (col. 9, line 19) which can be programmed by a transmitting unit. PINNOW IN COLUMN 2, LINES 1-3 DISCLOSES THAT IT WAS KNOWN IN THE ART TO PROGRAM A TRANSMITTER DURING MANUFACTURING. In column 3, lines 16-18, Pinnow suggests the transmitter MAY be reprogrammed. This suggests the transmitter need not be reprogrammed or can be preprogrammed during manufacturing.
2. Pinnow in column 4, lines 31-42 suggests a SECURITY delay can be armed when a signal is first received and disarmed afterward if the signal is correct.
3. Sander et al have been cited to indicate that arming and disarming means have been long known in the art (see decision below). Also, as previously pointed out, "Applicant does not deny that, as of the effective filing date of this application, remote control vehicle security systems were known, which were armed or disarmed by the remote transmitter".

A. Prior Art

1. Factual Reference Need Not Antedate

In re Langer, 183 USPQ 288 (CCPA 1974)

Even though effective date, for prior art purposes, of many of the references is subsequent to applicant's earliest filing date, the references are properly cited for purpose of showing a fact.

In re Wilson, 135 USPQ 442 (CCPA 1962)

A bulletin published by a chemical company could be used as evidence of factual characteristics of prior art in foam products in determining patentability of a process for making foamed polyester materials, even though date of the publication was later than the filing date of the patent application.